



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,378	09/17/2003	Steven A. Rogers	006389.00002	2690
22507	7590	04/01/2008	EXAMINER	
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD. 1100 13th STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051			MERED, HABTE	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2616		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		04/01/2008		PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/663,378	ROGERS, STEVEN A.	
	<b>Examiner</b> HABTE MERED	<b>Art Unit</b> 2616	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) HABTE MERED.

(3) Steven Roger (Inventor).

(2) Chi Pham, Aung Moe.

(4) Bradley Wright (Attorney).

Date of Interview: 28 March 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: Power Point presentation off invitation.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 37.

Identification of prior art discussed: Klassen et al (US 6, 71, 137) and Barton et al (US Pub. No. 2002/0031144).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Inventor briefly discussed invention using an earlier prepared power point presentation along with a video demo. Applicant's Attorney pointed out what he perceives as shortcomings of the prior arts with respect to claims 1 and 37. Examiner also presented his view of the prior art and how it applies to claims 1 and 37. No conclusive agreement was reached.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Aung S. Moe/  
SPE 2616

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an  
Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required